

# **BACK TO: COMPETITIVE PLANS**

A Presentation to the  
Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission

February 9, 2004

# Summary of Test (s)

## **GOAL:**

Adjust the Grid to improve competitiveness

- The only criteria were competitiveness, contiguity, and equal population. AQD spread was used in-progress, with frequent pauses to run JudgeIt on the work.
- Cities, Counties, Communities, Reservations, visible borders, and public input not taken into account for this step in the process.
- Complies with Judge's findings and order: favor competitiveness by using competitiveness in the very first changes to the grid.
- Exceed Competitiveness of the Hall-Minkoff test

## **Process:**

NDC did preliminary work, reviewed and revised with Dr. McDonald on Feb. 5 and 6 to develop two plans:

- A: Target: districts with 7 % spread
- B: Target: districts with nearly 0 % spread, then others with 7 % spread

# Plans to present

- ◆ Grid
- ◆ A1: NDC initial test "A"
- ◆ A2: test A developed with Dr. McDonald
- ◆ B1: NDC initial test "B"
- ◆ B2: test B developed with Dr. McDonald

# Competitiveness

	1990s Plan	Grid	2001 Plan	2002 Plan	2004 Plan	Hall-Minkoff Test	Comp A1	Comp B1	Comp A2	Comp B2
AQD < 7%	5	4	4	4	3	7	23	14	22	16
Judge It < 7%		6		6	4	7	21	16	23	23

# City Splits

	1990s Plan	Grid	2001 Plan	2002 Plan	2004 Plan	Hall-Minkoff Test	Comp A1	Comp B1	Comp A2	Comp B2
Split Cities	17	22	17	16	15	17	31	41	30	42
# of Splits	54	61	57	54	54	57	112	130	114	137

# Compactness

	1990s Plan	Grid	2001 Plan	2002 Plan	2004 Plan	Hall-Minkoff Test	Comp A1	Comp B1	Comp A2	Comp B2
P-P <0.17	10	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	10	16
Perimeter Sum	10,448	6,717	8,687	8,735	8,814	8,795	11,219	10,067	12,033	10,841

# **BACK TO: COMPETITIVE PLANS**

A Presentation to the  
Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission

February 9, 2004